UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/845,785 | 04/30/2001 | Karen P. Parnell | 005306.P019 | 4346 |

7590 01/19/2006

Lance A. Termes
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| SPOONER, LAMONT M | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2654 | |

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/845,785 | PARNELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Lamont M. Spooner | 2654 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,9,16-19,22,26,33,34 and 38-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,9,16-19,22,26,33,34 and 38-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments, Lee does not teach or suggest maintaining language dependant code of a base version of an application separately from language independent code of the base version of the application, and facilitating the internationalization of the base version of the application, where the internationalization includes pseudo localization of the language independent code of the base version of the application. Neither does Lee teach or suggest facilitating a localization of the base version of the application, where the localization includes generating a base glossary for the language dependent code. The Examiner cannot concur, Lee teaches, C.4.lines 9-16, having a library control feature, and library control database that tracks all changes to the language source file that would require a translation. This is directly interpreted as a stored separate maintenance of language dependent code. Furthermore, the applicant does not disclose or teach internationalization includes pseudo localization of the language independent code, see 35 USC 112 rejection below, and for purposes of examination the Examiner has interpreted the limitation as pseudo localization of the base version of the application . Lee further facilitates localization which includes generating a base glossary for the language independent code, more specifically ... the L10N process (C.10.line 58-C.11.line 39) further includes generation of a base glossary

(C.10.lines 58-60-his seeds), translation of the base glossary, (C.3.line 67-C.4.line 1, 14-16, C.11.lines 5-9-translated files include a base glossary).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 1 (and similar claims 18, and 34) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically, the limitation "wherein the internationalization comprises pseudo localization of the language independent code of the base version of the application." is not found in the disclosure. For example, p.18.lines 1-22, including "Pseudo localization comprises a process of simulating localization by adding prefix characters to all translatable strings in the application, and altering any locale-specific setting in the operating environment, e.g., date, time, number, currency format, or the like. Pseudo localization may be utilized for international testing prior to having the true translation available. A pseudo localization build of the application is treated as just another language version of the UI code. The pseudo localization build may be designed to automatically perform the actual pseudo translation by modifying translatable base language strings to incorporate the prefix mentioned above." does not teach the rejected limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-18, 19, 22, 26, 33 and 34 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (hereinafter referred to as Lee, US 6,442,516) in view of Rojas et al. (hereinafter referred to as Rojas, US 6,425,123).

Lee and Rojas are analogous art in that they both involve the development process of software.

As per **claims 1, 18 and 34**, Lee discloses a method facilitating a polylingual simultaneous shipment of the application, the method comprising:

storing a base version of the application in a base language (C.2.lines 57-67), wherein the language dependant code is maintained separately from language independent code of the base version of the application (C.4.lines 8-17-language dependent code tracked from language independent code not requiring translation in a base language, .4.lines 9-16, having a library control feature (translatable components only in these fields, i.e. his available field of database... translation, and library control database that tracks all changes to the language source file that would require a translation);

facilitating an internationalization (I18N) of the base version of the application (C.3.lines 56-63, C.4.lines 58-64); and

concurrently (C.3.lines 59-61) facilitating a L10N of the base version of the application, wherein the L10N comprises generating a base glossary for the language dependent code, the base glossary being translated into at least one language different from the base language (C.3.lines 56-57, C.10.lines 10-16, the L10N process, C.10.line 58-C.11.line 39, C.10.lines 58-60-his seeds as the base glossary, C.3.line 67-C.4.line 1, 14-16, C.11.lines 5-9, 13-15-translated files include a base glossary).

but lacks disclosing the I18N implementing an internationalization (I18N) of the base version of the application, wherein the I18N process comprises pseudo localization (L10N) of the base version of the application;

However, Rojas teaches having an I18N process including a pseudo L10N of a base version of an application (C.2.line 48-C.3.line 5). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Lee with Rojas by implementing a mock L10N. The motivation for doing so would have been to test language translatability in computer software (C.2.lines 45-47).

As per **claims 2, and 19**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Rojas further discloses storing the base version of the application comprises:

identifying all language-dependent user interface code (C.4.lines 34-45); and

creating a source code structure for the application wherein the language-dependent user interface code is maintained separately from non user interface code (C.4.lines 35-37-separate executable program).

As per **claims 5 and 22**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Lee further discloses:

the base language is English (C.6.lines 30-34).

As per **claims 9 and 26**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends.

Rojas also teaches pseudo L10N includes adding a prefix to each translatable string in the application (C.4.lines 58-67).

As per **claims 16 and 33**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 16 depends. Lee further discloses

the at least one language different from the base language is selected from the group consisting of: German, Spanish, French, Japanese, Danish, Dutch, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish, Chinese, Korean, Czech, Finnish, Greek, and Hebrew (C.10.lines 10-15-French, C.11.lines 45-47).

As per **claim 17**, Lee and Rojas disclose dependent claim 1, Rojas further teaches wherein the application (C.2.lines 40-44) comprises a front end (C.4.lines 45, 46-irequired as a front end development), a middle (C.4.lines 33-45), and a data model (C.4.lines 46-52-data model), wherein the front end comprises user interface code developed in a base language (C.4.lines 34-45, 53, 54-base language interface code required to initiate the process), and the middle comprises non user interface code developed in a programming language (C.4.lines 35-37-separate executable program follows the initiated front end);

As per **claim 38**, Lee and Rojas disclose dependent claim 1, and Lee further teaches a first portion of the language dependent code is stored in a master repository (C.2.lines 62-66-his all files logged in the library control database as the first portion) and a second portion of the language dependent code is stored in resource files (C.4.lines 8-15-his baselevel fields as the second portion ...resource files).

As per **claim 39**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 1, Lee further teaches the internalization further comprises identifying defects in a previous version of the application (C.4.lines 18-23-his "translated file downlevel" interpreted as defects, wherein they necessarily are modified, or fixed, C.4.lines 44-67, also his files that require changes, C.5.lines 39-44-the identified errors from the CMVC).

As per **claims 40 and 41**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 9, Rojas also teaches wherein the pseudo localization further comprises altering locale-specific settings (C.2.lines 48-67-his formatting and hard-coded text for the localization files, C.5.lines 31-37-his mock translation) in an operating environment (C.6.lines 36-48-his hard-coded text, Fig. 5 item 510).

wherein the locale-specific settings comprise at least one of a date, a time, a number, a currency format and a hard-coded reference to a translation (C.2.lines 48-67-his formatting, and C.6.lines 36-48-his hard-coded text, Fig. 5 item 510).

As per **claim 42**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 9, and Lee further teaches wherein the pseudo localization further comprises identifying hard-coded strings in the application by simulating localization of the application (C.6.lines 37-48, Figs. 4 and 5).

As per **claim 43**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 1, Lee further teaches generating the base glossary comprises creating a list of base language strings (C.10.lines 59, and 60-his sets of files from language objects, the language objects as the base language strings in the CMVC).

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

lms
1/10/05